

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		G DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,872	72 04/10/2001		Brian J. Stockman	6311.N	7416
26813	7590	09/15/2004	•	EXAMINER	
	, RAASCH	BORIN, MI	BORIN, MICHAEL L		
P.O. BOX 5 MINNEAPO	81415 DLIS, MN 5	5458		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1631	
				DATE MAILED: 09/15/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/829,872	STOCKMAN, BRIAN J.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
•	Michael Borin	1631
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED $O_{\rm S}$ FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLED From the properties of the pro	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ition. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period o ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic iled, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH date on which the petition under 37 CF f extension and the corresponding amothe shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	
The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	* *	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancell	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	· · 	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		idered but does NOT place the
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we	· · · 	_
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,6-8,17 and 19-22.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 9-13.		
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appl	roved or b) disapproved by	he Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	<u>-</u>
0. Other:		11 Bank
		Michael Borin, Ph.D. Primary Examiner

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection is maintained for the reasons of record. Also, Applicant argues that claim language drawn to identification of a ligand binding site distinguishes ligand binding from non-specific binding and protein binding to itself. The prior art used in the rejection is also drawn to ligand (DNA) binding, and not related to unspecific binding or dimerization..